UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/596,853	06/19/2000	Sho Kou	SONY-50N3456.01	4217

7590 07/28/2005

Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
NALEVANKO, CHRISTOPHER R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2611	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/596,853	KOU, SHO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher R. Nalevanko	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 23-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 23-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *05/05/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 04/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Claims 1 and 11, Applicant argues that "Ozkan fails to teach or suggest the underscored claim limitations. . . Klosterman fails to teach the claim limitations, 'wherein said value in attribute field refines identification of said table being requested,' or the claim limitations 'said step of defining the type of table said attribute field describes, wherein the type of table said attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of tables.' Klosterman's encryption flag (fig. 3, 72) may describe whether or not data has been encrypted, but does not teach or suggest the type of table said attribute filed describes, as claimed. Furthermore, Klosterman's decryption key ID (fig. 2, 74) identifies what key should be used to decrypt the data (if encrypted), but does not teach or suggest the type of table said attribute field describes, as claimed" (page 10 lines 1-2, 10-21). Examiner asserts that Klosterman is not used to show the aspect of tables. Ozkan is used to show using a variety of tables to supply data to a system (col. 5 lines 45-61, processor 22 matches the PIDs of incoming packets provided by unit 17 with PID values pre-loaded in control registers within unit 22 by processor 60, processor 60 accesses, parses and assembles the packets captured by processor 22 and stores the program specific information within its internal memory). Ozkan clearly teaches that processor 60 sets values in the register unit 22, which is a command to the first device. Based on this command or bits in the register, the appropriate tables are returned and

stored in processor 60). As correctly noted by the Applicant, Ozkan does fail to specifically state that the command field refines identification of information being requested or that the second device sets one flag of a plurality of flags in the command, the step of setting defining the type of information the attribute field describes, wherein the type of information the attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of information. This is the reason that Klosterman is used. Klosterman clearly shows Klosterman shows that the command attribute field refines identification of information being requested (page 3 sections 0029, fig. 3, command type 70, defining the type of command issued). Furthermore, Klosterman shows setting one flag of a plurality of flags in the command (page 3 section 0029, flags 72 and 74), the step of setting defining the type of information the attribute field describes (page 3 section 0029, flags describing whether or not the data is encrypted), wherein the type of information the attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of information (fig. 3, page 3 section 0029-0031, various command types and attribute fields). Finally, Klosterman shows that these commands are used between two devices for setting up decoding of television programs (page 3 sections 0023-0024, fig. 2, IR receiver and microprocessor issuing commands to setup receiving). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan with the ability to use multiple command fields and flags, as shown in Klosterman, so that the system components could perform a variety of different commands and control the receiver accordingly. Although Klosterman only shows that information or data or requested and defined, Ozkan has previously supported and clearly discloses the use of multiple data tables. Because

Ozkan has already shown the use of a variety of tables and Klosterman shows the deficiencies of Ozkan, the claimed limitations have been met.

2. Regarding Claims 2 and 10, Applicant's failure to adequately traverse the Examiner's taking of Official Notice in the last office action is taken as an admission of the facts noticed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-17, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozkan et al (6,115,074) in further view of Klosterman et al (2003/0167473).

Regarding Claim 1, Ozkan shows a digital television receiving system with a first device for receiving a digital television bit-stream (col. 2 lines 48-67, col. 3 lines 12-22, fig. 1 items 13, 15, 17, and 22, input processing components). Ozkan further shows a second device setting a command, the command for requesting a table of plurality of tables regarding the bit-stream (col. 3 lines 47-52, processor 60 setting control register, col. 5 lines 35-62, setting values in control register to request tables). Although not specifically stated, it is nonetheless inherent that there is some field that is set to designate the command. Ozkan finally shows the second device, or processor, issuing the

command to the first device (col. 3 lines 47-52, processor 60 setting control register, col. 5 lines 35-62, setting values in control register to request tables) and the first device returning one of a plurality of tables to the second device (col. 5 lines 45-61, processor 22 matches the PIDs of incoming packets provided by unit 17 with PID values pre-loaded in control registers within unit 22 by processor 60, processor 60 accesses, parses and assembles the packets captured by processor 22 and stores the program specific information within its internal memory) in response to the command. When a user requests a channel, the processor receives the request and issues a command to the input components. The processor receives a table which describes the sub-channels that are contained in the particular PTC selected by the user. The processor then uses the returned table to tune and manipulate the decoder to decode the correct sub-channel. Ozkan fails to specifically state that the command field refines identification of information being requested or that the second device sets one flag of a plurality of flags in the command, the step of setting defining the type of information the attribute field describes, wherein the type of information the attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of information. Klosterman shows that the command attribute field refines identification of information being requested (page 3 sections 0029, fig. 3, command type 70, defining the type of command issued). Furthermore, Klosterman shows setting one flag of a plurality of flags in the command (page 3 section 0029, flags 72 and 74), the step of setting defining the type of information the attribute field describes (page 3 section 0029, flags describing whether or not the data is encrypted), wherein the type of information the attribute field describes is selectable between

multiple types of information (fig. 3, page 3 section 0029-0031, various command types and attribute fields). Finally, Klosterman shows that these commands are used between two devices for setting up decoding of television programs (page 3 sections 0023-0024, fig. 2, IR receiver and microprocessor issuing commands to setup receiving). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan with the ability to use multiple command fields and flags, as shown in Klosterman, so that the system components could perform a variety of different commands and control the receiver accordingly.

Regarding Claim 2, Ozkan shows using a master guide table, virtual channel tables, event information tables, extended text tables, and a variety of other tables (col. 4 lines 3-21, col. 7 lines 1-56). Ozkan and Klosterman fail to show a system time table and a ratings table. Official Notice is give that it is well known and expected in the art to use system time tables and ratings tables. These tables provide more information to the user regarding the show and help synchronize program content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan and Klosterman with the ability to store and use a system time table and a ratings table in order to provide the user with valuable information regarding the program and so that the programs could be properly synchronized.

Regarding Claim 3, Ozkan shows that the command can be a command that directly selects data (col. 5 lines 45-61, processor 22 matches the PIDs of incoming packets provided by unit 17 with PID values pre-loaded in control registers within unit 22

by processor 60, processor 60 accesses, parses and assembles the packets captured by processor 22 and stores the program specific information within its internal memory).

Regarding Claim 6, Ozkan shows a tuner device, or decoder (figure 1 items 15, 17, and 100).

Regarding Claim 7, Ozkan shows the second device is a controller (see figure 1 item 60 and 64, col. 5 lines 34-60).

Regarding Claim 8, Ozkan shows that the bit-stream comprises digitized audio, video, data, and tables (col. 2 lines 5-16, col. 3 lines 15-29, col. 4 lines 3-21).

Regarding Claim 9, Ozkan shows that the video is in MPEG format (col. 2 lines 5-15, 50-62).

Regarding Claim 10, Ozkan shows the use of a bi-direction data bus (col. 3 lines 50-52, fig. 1). Ozkan and Klosterman fail to show the use of an IEEE 1394 serial bus. Official Notice is taken that it is well know and expected in the art to use an IEEE 1394 serial bus to connect device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan and Klosterman with a serial bus so that the system would use a well-known industry standard to communicate between devices.

Regarding Claim 11, Ozkan shows a first device having a memory unit for storing a command (fig. 1 item 60 processor, col. 3 lines 30-50). Although not specifically stated, it is nonetheless inherent that there is some field that is set to designate the command. Ozkan also shows a table field for specifying a table identifier and a multi purpose field for specifying one of a plurality of attributes related to the table (figs. 2-6,

tables with multiple fields for describing attributes of the bit stream and received data, descriptor tags, and table Ids, col. 5 lines 15-60, hierarchically arranged tables with supplementary descriptor information). These fields identify the type of information held in all fields. Ozkan further shows a second device connected to the bit-stream (col. 2 lines 48-67, col. 3 lines 12-22, fig. 1 items 13, 15, 17, and 22, input processing components), a commincation link connecting the first device and second device (fig. 1, col. 3 lines 45-52, signal bus), and first device issuing a command to second device (col. 3 lines 47-52, processor 60 setting control register, col. 5 lines 35-62, setting values in control register to request tables). Ozkan finally shows the second device returning one of a plurality of tables to the first device based on information in the command and multi-purpose field (col. 5 lines 45-61, processor 22 matches the PIDs of incoming packets provided by unit 17 with PID values pre-loaded in control registers within unit 22 by processor 60, processor 60 accesses, parses and assembles the packets captured by processor 22 and stores the program specific information within its internal memory). Ozkan fails to specifically state that the command has a plurality of flags and a plurality of attribute fields, where the attribute fields stores different information, and the plurality of flags are configurable to identify the type of information in the attribute fields. Klosterman shows that the command attribute field refines identification of information being requested (page 3 sections 0029, fig. 3, command type 70, defining the type of command issued). Furthermore, Klosterman shows setting one flag of a plurality of flags in the command (page 3 section 0029, flags 72 and 74), the step of setting defining the type of information the attribute field describes (page 3 section 0029, flags describing

whether or not the data is encrypted), wherein the type of information the attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of information (fig. 3, page 3 section 0029-0031, various command types and attribute fields). Finally, Klosterman shows that these commands are used between two devices for setting up decoding of television programs (page 3 sections 0023-0024, fig. 2, IR receiver and microprocessor issuing commands to setup receiving). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan with the ability to use multiple command fields and flags, as shown in Klosterman, so that the system components could perform a variety of different commands and control the receiver accordingly.

Regarding Claim 12, Ozkan shows that depending on the user selected channel, the command sets a variety of bits to indicate a bundle number and sub-channel (col. 6 lines 10-65). This information denotes which table is to be returned to the processor to look up the correct channel number. Ozkan also shows returning, based on commands, an extended text table (col. 8 lines 30-67, col. 9 lines 1-32, col. 10 lines 40-56).

Regarding Claim 13, the limitations of the claim have bee discussed with regards to claim 7.

Regarding Claim 14, the limitations of the claim have bee discussed with regards to claim 6.

Regarding Claim 15, the limitations of the claim have bee discussed with regards to claim 8.

Regarding Claim 16, the limitations of the claim have bee discussed with regards to claim 9.

Regarding Claim 30, Ozkan shows using a master guide table, virtual channel tables, event information tables, extended text tables, and a variety of other tables (col. 4 lines 3-21, col. 7 lines 1-56). Ozkan and Klosterman fail to show a source identification and a ratings table. Official Notice is give that it is well known and expected in the art to use system source tables and ratings tables. These tables provide more information to the user regarding the show and help synchronize program content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan and Klosterman with the ability to store and use a system time table and a ratings table in order to provide the user with valuable information regarding the program and so that the programs could be properly synchronized.

4. Claim 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozkan et al (6,115,074).

Regarding Claim 23, Ozkan shows a method of providing bitstream information comprising accessing a digital television bitstream (col. 2 lines 48-67, col. 3 lines 12-22, fig. 1 items 13, 15, 17, and 22, input processing components), first device having a memory unit for storing a command (fig. 1 item 60 processor, col. 3 lines 30-50). Although not specifically stated, it is nonetheless inherent that there is some field that is set to designate the command. Ozkan also shows a table field for specifying a table identifier and a multi purpose field for specifying one of a plurality of attributes related to the table (figs. 2-6, tables with multiple fields for describing attributes of the bit stream and received data, descriptor tags, and table Ids, col. 5 lines 15-60, hierarchically

arranged tables with supplementary descriptor information). These fields identify the type of information held in all fields. Ozkan further shows a second device connected to the bit-stream (col. 2 lines 48-67, col. 3 lines 12-22, fig. 1 items 13, 15, 17, and 22, input processing components), a communication link connecting the first device and second device (fig. 1, col. 3 lines 45-52, signal bus), and first device issuing a command to second device (col. 3 lines 47-52, processor 60 setting control register, col. 5 lines 35-62, setting values in control register to request tables). Ozkan finally shows the second device returning one of a plurality of tables to the first device based on information in the command and multi-purpose field (col. 5 lines 45-61, processor 22 matches the PIDs of incoming packets provided by unit 17 with PID values pre-loaded in control registers within unit 22 by processor 60, processor 60 accesses, parses and assembles the packets captured by processor 22 and stores the program specific information within its internal memory). Ozkan shows using a master guide table, virtual channel tables, event information tables, extended text tables, and a variety of other tables (col. 4 lines 3-21, col. 7 lines 1-56). Ozkan fails to show a system time table and a ratings table. Official Notice is give that it is well known and expected in the art to use system time tables and ratings tables. These tables provide more information to the user regarding the show and help synchronize program content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan with the ability to store and use a system time table and a ratings table in order to provide the user with valuable information regarding the program and so that the programs could be properly synchronized.

Regarding Claim 24, Ozkan shows setting a flag indicating that the data is valid (figs. 2-6, tables with multiple fields for describing attributes of the bit stream and received data, descriptor tags, and table Ids, col. 5 lines 15-60, hierarchically arranged tables with supplementary descriptor information).

Regarding Claim 25, Ozkan shows setting a value in the table field. Ozkan shows a table field for specifying a table identifier and a multi purpose field for specifying one of a plurality of attributes related to the table (figs. 2-6, tables with multiple fields for describing attributes of the bit stream and received data, descriptor tags, and table Ids, col. 5 lines 15-60, hierarchically arranged tables with supplementary descriptor information). These fields identify the type of information held in all fields. Ozkan further shows a second device connected to the bit-stream (col. 2 lines 48-67, col. 3 lines 12-22, fig. 1 items 13, 15, 17, and 22, input processing components), a communication link connecting the first device and second device (fig. 1, col. 3 lines 45-52, signal bus), and first device issuing a command to second device (col. 3 lines 47-52, processor 60 setting control register, col. 5 lines 35-62, setting values in control register to request tables). Ozkan finally shows the second device returning one of a plurality of tables to the first device based on information in the command and multi-purpose field (col. 5 lines 45-61, processor 22 matches the PIDs of incoming packets provided by unit 17 with PID values pre-loaded in control registers within unit 22 by processor 60, processor 60 accesses, parses and assembles the packets captured by processor 22 and stores the program specific information within its internal memory).

Regarding Claim 26, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 25.

Regarding Claim 27, Ozaka shows the user directly selects the command (col. 3 lines 30-40, user selects for viewing the channel and the processor performs control functions).

Regarding Claim 28, Ozkan shows using a master guide table, virtual channel tables, event information tables, extended text tables, and a variety of other tables (col. 4 lines 3-21, col. 7 lines 1-56). Ozkan fails to show a system a ratings table. Official Notice is give that it is well known and expected in the art to use system time tables and ratings tables. These tables provide more information to the user regarding the show and help synchronize program content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan with the ability to store and use a system time table and a ratings table in order to provide the user with valuable information regarding the program and so that the programs could be properly synchronized.

Regarding Claim 29, Ozkan shows using a master guide table, virtual channel tables, event information tables, extended text tables, and a variety of other tables (col. 4 lines 3-21, col. 7 lines 1-56). Ozkan fails to show a system time table and a ratings table. Official Notice is give that it is well known and expected in the art to use system time tables and ratings tables. These tables provide more information to the user regarding the show and help synchronize program content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan with

the ability to store and use a system time table and a ratings table in order to provide the user with valuable information regarding the program and so that the programs could be properly synchronized.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Nalevanko whose telephone number is 571-272-7299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher Nalevanko
AU 2611
571-272-7299

cn

CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600